Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00694 01 OF 02 101452Z

46

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 EURE-00 CU-02 USIE-00 SSO-00

NSCE-00 INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 BIB-01

AECE-00 /078 W

----- 093845

O R 101330Z FEB 75 FM USMISSION NATO TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0012 INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4986 AMEMBASSY MOSCOW USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE USDEL MBFR VIENNA

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0694

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO, CSCE

SUBJ: CSCE: FEBRUARY 7 NAC CONSULTATIONS

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE AND USDEL SALT II

REF: USNATO 0674

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. ALL DAY NAC SESSION ON CSCE, ATTENDED BY MOST GENEVA DELEGATION HEADS, BEGAN WITH ITALIAN PRESENTATION, ALONG FAMILIAR LINES, OF EC-NINE POSITIONS AGREED AT DUBLIN. DISCUSSION THEREAFTER FOCUSED ON CBM'S AND CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP. ON FORMER, MAJORITY FAVORED OR LINKAGE BETWEEN PACE OF WORK ON CBM'S AND PRINCIPLES DECLARATION. US PREFERRED TO HOLD SUCH AN APPROACH UNTIL LATER, IN EVENT SOVIETS REMAIN TOTALLY NEGATIVE ON CBM'S. NETHERLANDS PROPOSED NEW APPROACH TO FIXING THRESHOLD FOR MANEUVER PREANNOUNCEMENT (SEE PARA 6). LENGTHY CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00694 01 OF 02 101452Z

DISCUSSION OF CSCE FOLLOW-UP REVEALED NO SHIFT IN WELL-KNOWN NATIONAL POSITIONS: FRANCE, FRG, ITALY, NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM AND TURKEY VERY RESERVED FORWARD REGULAR POLITICAL FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS; UK, NORWAY AND DENMARK

MORE POSITIVE. DISCUSSION OTHER ISSUE RATHER PERFUNCTORY, BUT CANADA EXPLICITLY CRITICIZED PROPOSED QUADRIPARTITE DISCLAIMER IN PRINCIPLES DECLARATION, CLAIMING ITS LANGUAGE WOULD APPEAR TO AFFIRM SOVIET SUPREMACY IN EASTERN EUROPE. MOST EXPRESSED GUARDED SATISFACTION ON PACE OF WORK IN GENEVA.
BUT SOME SPEAKERS INTERPRETED SOVIET RIGIDITY SO FAR ON SUBSTANTIVE POINTS AS OPENING MOVE IN TACTIC DESIGNED TO LEAVE IMPORTANT ISSUES UNRESOLVED UNTIL LATE IN STAGE II, IN EXPECTATION THAT TIME PRESSURE WOULD THEN FORCE WESTERN AND NEUTRAL PARTICIPANTS TO ACCEPT MINIMAL RESULTS. FULL TEXT OF AMBASSADOR SHERER'S STATEMENT, AS DELIVERED, SENT SEPTEL. END SUMMARY.

- 2. PACE OF NEGOTIATIONS. MOST EXPRESSED QUALIFIED SATISFACTION WITH PACE OF WORK SO FAR IN GENEVA, NOTING THAT PROGRESS IS USUALLY SLOW IN FIRST THREE-FOUR WEEKS AFTER A BREAK IN THE TALKS. MOST THOUGHT SOVIET ATTITUDE WAS ONE OF BUSINESS AS USUAL, BUT SEVERAL ALSO REFERRED TO SOVIET RIGIDITY ON SUBSTATIVE ISSUES. NETHERLANDS (VAN DER VALK), ECHOED BY FRG AND BELGIUM, SAID IT IS NORMAL SOVIET TACTIC TO DRAG THINGS OUT IN PENULTIMATE PHASE OF NEGOTIATIONS, IN HOPE OF BRINGING INTENSE TIME PRESSURE ON OPPOSING SIDE DURING FINAL PHASE. IN VIEW OF THESE DELEGATIONS, "WAR OF NERVES" MAY HAVE ALREADY BEGUN, AND WEST SHOULD NOT ALLOW ITSELF TO BE PUT UNDER TIME PRESSURE.
- 3. CBM'S. ALL WHO SPOKE EXPRESSED CONCERN AT SLOW PROGRESS IN THIS AREA. MOST EC-NINE DELEGATIONS ARGUED FOR EXTABLISHING SOME FORM OF PARALLELISM BETWEEN PROGRESS ON CBM'S AND ON PRINCIPLES DECLARATION. NETHERLANDS, FRG, AND BELGIUM WERE PARTICULARLY EMPHATIC ON THIS POINT AND WERE SUPPORTED BY NORWAY AND TURKEY. UK WAS MORE RESERVED. NORWAY (MEVIK) CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00694 01 OF 02 101452Z

SIAD FORCEFULLY THAT THE SOVIETS MUST NOT GET IDEA THEY CAN WAIT UNTIL THE VERY END OF STAGE II AND THEN OBLIGE THE WEST TO ACCEPT MINIMAL CBM AGREEMENT. MEVIK ALSO REITERATED NORWEGIAN PROPOSAL FOR VOLUNTARY NOTIFICATION OF SMALL MANEUVERS AND OF INDEPENDENT AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS.

4. U.S. (SHERER) EXPRESSED CONCERN AT LACK OF PRIOR CONSULTATION BY NINE WITH U.S. BEFORE PUTTING LIKAGE QUESTION TO SOVIET DELEGATION IN GENEVA. SHERER ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT U.S. COULD CONSIDER JOINING IN BILATERAL APPROACHES TO SOVIETS, OR IN RAISING SUBJECT IN COORDINATING COMMITTEE. RESPONDING,

BELGIUM (HERPIN) SAID NINE DID NOT ADVOCATE RIGID
LINK WITH WORK ON PRINCIPLES DECLARATION. HOWEVER,
SOVIETS MUST BE MADE TO UNDERSTAND THAT THEY
CANNOT "GET AWAY WITH" REFUSING ANY CONCESSIONS ON
CBM'S, WHILE OTHER CONFERENCE WORK MOVES AHEAD NORMALLY.
ITALY (FERRARIS) SAID NINE HAD ALWAYS FAVORED APPROXIMATE PARALELISM BETWEEN ALL ASPECTS OF CSCE WORK.
THUS THE PROPOSED CBM-PRINCIPLES "LINKAGE" WAS NO
NEW DEPARTURE.

5. FRG (BLECH) EXPRESSED HOPE THAT NINE-S POSITION
ON CBM-PRINCIPLES LINKAGE WOULD BECOME THAT OF FIFTEEN. ALLIES
SHOULD BEGIN WORK TO DEVELOP OUTLINE OF
AN ACCEPTABLE FINAL TEXT OF CBM'S, BEGINNING
WITH LANGUAGE ALREADY REGISTERED IN GENEVA AND ADDING
PORTIONS COVERING AREAS ON WHICH THERE WAS NOT YET
ANY EAST-WEST AGREEMENT. IN SETTING OUT VIEWS
BLECH SAID THAT TWO THINGS WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE TO THE FRG: NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS
ONLY IN FRONTIER ZONES; AND NOTIFICATION ONLY TO
NEIGHBORING STATES.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00694 02 OF 02 101503Z

46

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 EURE-00 ISO-00 CU-02 USIE-00 SSO-00

NSCE-00 INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 BIB-01

AECE-00 /078 W

----- 093952

O R 101330Z FEB 75 FM USMISSION NATO TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0013 INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4987 AMEMBASSY MOSCOW USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0694

6. NETHERLANDS (VAN DER VALK) SUGGESTED NEW APPROACH TO PROBLEM OF CBM PARAMETERS, CALLING IT "A NATIONAL POSITION" AND SUGGESTING ALLIANCE SHOULD STUDY IT. VAN DER VALK SAID FIRST STEP WOULD BE TO MOVE GENEVA

DISCUSSION AWAY FROM MILITARY TECHNICALITIES AND TRY
TO GET GENERAL AGREEMENT ON POLITICAL VALUE OF CBMS.
NEXT STEP WOULD BE TO ESTABLISH ROUGHLY HOW MANY
MANEUVERS PER YEAR WE WOULD WANT EACH SIDE TO ANNOUNCE
IN ORDER TO GAIN THOSE POLITICAL BENEFITS. PERHAPS
TEN MANEUVERS PER YEAR WOULD BE AN OPTIMUM NUMBER.
NETHERLANDS HAS IMPRESSION THAT, IF NATO PARAMETERS
WERE USED, EACH SIDE WOULD BE NOTIFYING IN THE ORDER
OF 100 MANEUVERS PER YEAR, AND THAT WOULD BE TOO
MANY. IF SOVIET PARAMETERS WERE USED AS BASIS,
PERHAPS ONLY ONE MANEUVER WOULD BE ANNOUNCED ANNUALLY
AND THAT WOULD BE TOO LITTLE. ONCE AN OPTIUM ANNUAL
NUMBER OF MANEUVER ANNOUNCEMENTS HAS BEEN AGREED
UPON, THE ALLIES CAN WORK BACK FROM THERE TOWARD
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00694 02 OF 02 101503Z

SPECIFIC PARAMETER THAT WOULD YIELD THAT RESULT.

7. AT CONCLUSION OF DISCUSSION, ASYG PANSA ASKED IMS TO PROVIDE ESTIMATES OF NUMBER OF MANEUVERS THAT WOULD BE ANNOUNCED UNDER VARIOUS THRESHOLD PROPOSALS ON TABLE IN GENEVA.

8. CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP. ITALY. FRANCE, FRG AND OTHERS TOOK RESERVED VIEW OF REGULARIZED FOLLOW-UP. FRENCH REP (PIERRET) SAID HIS GOVERNMENT ATTACHED VERY GREAT IMPORTANCE TO THIS ISSUE. THE DANISH PROPOSAL ALREADY REPRESENTS A COMPROMISE, AND IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT" FOR FRANCE TO GO FURTHER. FRENCH ARE NOT PERSUADED THAT INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE MULTILATERAL PRO-CESS BEGUN IN HELSINKI IS NECESSARILY TO THE WESTERN ADVANTAGE. PIERRET PLACED GREAT STRESS ON THE NEED TO VERIFY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CSCE AGREEMENTS BEFORE DECIDING QUESTION OF REGULAR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES; TO DO THIS, A FAIRLY LONG INTERIM PERIOD BETWEEN CSCE AND FIRST MEETING OF SENIOR OFFICIALS WOULD BE NECESSARY. FRG (BLECH) ECHOED THIS POINT AND ADDED THAT TRE-MENDOUS AMOUNT OF TECHNICAL FOLLOW-UP WOULD ALSO FLOW FROM CSCE. BLECH IMPLIED THAT ALLIES WOULD WISH TO EVALUATE THIS WORK TOO BEFORE AGREEING TO ANY SCHEME FOR REGULAR POLITICAL FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS.

9. PREDICTABLY, UK, NORWAY AND DENMARK WERE MORE SANGUINE ABOUT THE VALUE TO THE WEST OF REGULAR FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS. UK (BURNS), REFERRING TO HIS GOVERNMENTS'S PAPER ON THE SUBJECT, SAID WEST CAN RESIST THE DANGERS OF REGULAR FOLLOW-UP ACTIITIES AND SHOULD PAY MORE ATTENTION TO THE ADVANTAGES. POST-CSCE INTERIM PERIOD SHOULD NOT BE TOO LONG. DENMARK (MELLBIN) SAID ALLIES SHOULD NOT UNDERESTIMATE DETERMINATION OF ROMANIANS, OTHER EASTERN EUROPEANS AND THE NEUTRALS ON THE FOLLOW-UP ISSUE.

10. NORWAY SAID THAT EXPERIENCE AT HELSINKI AND GENEVA SHOWED THAT AN EXTENDED PROCESS OF MULTI-LATERAL DISCUSSIONS WAS NOT HARMFUL TO THE WEST AND COULD INDEED YIELD SOME POSITIVE RESULTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00694 02 OF 02 101503Z

THE PRESENT DANISH PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE NEUTRALS AND THE EASTERN EUROPEANS; SPECIFICALLY, THE INTERIM PERIOD PROPOSED IS TOO LONG. NORWAY WOULD PREFER A MEETING OF SENIOR OFFICIALS WITHIN A YEAR OR SO OF CONCLUSION OF CSCE TO TAKE STOCK OF THE SITUATION, REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION OF CSCE AGREEMENTS AND FIX TIME AND PLACE FOR FURTHER SUCH MEETINGS. NORWAY ASSUMES SEVERAL POST-CSCE MEETINGS OF SENIOR OFFICIALS WOULD TAKE PLACE. COMMENT: THIS CONFORMS

CLOSELY WITH NORWEGIAN STATEMENT MADE IN GENEVA IN APRIL 1974; SEE GENEVA 4418 OF NOVEMBER 11 FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS. END COMMENT.

11. PRINCIPLES. DISCUSSION OF THIS TOPIC FOLLOWED USUAL THEMES AND BROKE NO NEW GROUND, EXCEPT FOR CANADIAN CRITICISM OF DISCLAIMER ON QUADRIPARTITE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (QRR). CANADA UNDERSTOOD THE PROBLEM BUT DID NOT LIKE THE GENERAL WORDING OF THE TEXT; IT APPEARS TO AFFIRM SOVIET SUPREMACY IN EUROPE, AND A SOVIET OFFICIAL HAD SAID, IN A CONVERSATION WITH A CANADIAN COUNTERPART, THAT THE LANGUAGE WOULD GUARANTEE THE RESULTS OF WORLD WAR II. FRANCE AND UK SPOKE BRIEFLY IN SUPPORT OF QRR FORMULA.

12. BASKETS II AND III. DISCUSSION OF THESE ISSUES
WAS BRIEF AND PERFUNCTORY. PORTUGAL (ALMEIDA) SAID
HIS GOVERNMENT WOULD INSIST THAT, IF THE BASKET II
PREAMBLE WAS TO REFER TO LDC QUESTION, IT SHOULD USE
PHASE "DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN EUROPE"; "LESS DEVELOPED
COUNTRIES" IS NOT RPT NOT GOOD ENOUGH.
ALTERNATIVELY, PORTUGAL COULD ACCEPT NO RPT NO REFERENCE AT
ALL TO THIS PROBLEM IN CSCE CONTEXT.

13. LEGAL DIFFICULTIES WITH CSCE TEXTS. US INFORMED NAC OF MANNER IN WHICH WE INTEND TO DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM. SEVERAL EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR US APPROACH TO QUESTION. ALL WHO SPOKE TO THIS ISSUE EMPHASIZED THAT CSCE SHOULD NOT REPEAT NOT PRODUCE LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 00694 02 OF 02 101503Z

14. MEDITERRANEAN-MALTESE PROPOSAL. US REITERATED ITS CONCERNS ON MALTESE PROPOSAL. PORTUGAL CONCURRED, SAYING IT IS ESSENTIAL TO KILL MALTESE SUGGESTION GENTLY. ITALY AGREED MALTESE PROPOSAL HAD NO FUTURE BUT SAID IT WAS DELICATE MATTER AND ALLIES SHOULD CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE APPROPRIATE TACTICS.BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999 Channel Indicators: n/a

Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Concepts: n/a Control Number: n/a Copy: SINGLE Draft Date: 10 FEB 1975 Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960 Decaption Note: Disposition Action: RELEASED Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO00694

Document Number: 1975NATO00694
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00 Drafter: n/a

Enclosure: n/a Executive Order: 11652 GDS

Errors: n/a Film Number: n/a From: NATO

Handling Restrictions: n/a

Image Path:

Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrzicd.tel Line Count: 279

Locator: TEXT ON-LINE

Office: n/a

Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Original Handling Restrictions: n/a Original Previous Classification: n/a Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a

Page Count: 6

Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a Reference: USNATO 0674 Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED Review Authority: GolinoFR

Review Comment: n/a Review Content Flags: Review Date: 02 APR 2003

Review Event:

Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by MartinML>; APPROVED <03 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>

Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JÚL 2006

Review Media Identifier: Review Referrals: n/a Review Release Date: n/a Review Release Event: n/a **Review Transfer Date:** Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a

Secure: OPEN Status: NATIVE

Subject: CSCE: FEBRUARY 7 NAC CONSULTATIONS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO, CSCE
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

MOSCOW GENEVA MBFR VIENNA

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006

| Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2000 | 5 |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |